

4th March 1926]

13th August 1918, were allowed to draw their increments, by the head of the department, from the date of introduction of the time-scale of pay, i.e., from 1st March 1921 ;

(b) whether these clerks were subsequently not only deprived of the benefits of the time-scale of pay with reference to G.O. No. 164, Law (Education), dated 4th February 1925, but also ordered by the heads of offices to refund the amount of excess pay over the minimum of Rs. 35 already drawn by them from 1st March 1921 up to date ; and

(c) the reasons for this step ?

A.—(a) Yes, in some departments.

(b) & (c) Yes. Paragraph 4 of G.O. No. 164, Law (Education), dated 4th February 1925, referred to by the hon. Member, explains the reasons.

Heads of departments have, however, been informed that the Government are prepared to consider applications for waiver of recovery of overpayments by way of increments to the clerks in question.

Sriman SASIBUSHAN RATH Mahasaya :—“ Sir, it is stated in the answer ‘ Heads of departments have, however, been informed that the Government . . . in question.’ May I know if the Government intend to refund the recoveries already effected ? ”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“ That depends on the circumstances.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ May I know whether any recommendations have been received from the heads of departments ? ”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“ Yes, Sir, they are under consideration.”

### Civil Justice.

*The emoluments of the Official Assignee in Madras.*

\* 1524 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the monthly emoluments of the Official Assignee in Madras ;

(b) whether the Government are considering the proposal to fix a monthly salary for him in the place of commissions ; and

(c) if not, why not ?

A.—(a) The Government have no information but will call for it.

(b) No.

(c) The question was considered by Government in 1924 in consultation with the High Court. As the majority of the hon. the Judges were opposed to any change in the existing practice, the Government did not consider it expedient to take further steps in the matter.